

**List of Changes to the GDP Document dated September 29, 2010**

1. Updated the concept diagrams on pages 13, 14 and 15 to be consistent with the current road alignment.
2. Revised 'Site Concept' graphics on pages 17 and 18 to reflect revised conceptual plat. Major changes:
  - a) added a right-in/right-out drive lane from University Avenue between Lots 10 and 11.
  - b) created Outlot 4 between Lots 3 and 4; Outlot 1 now includes both southern and western edges.
3. Page 20: added a reference at bottom of text to the Metro Transit plan shown on page 52.
4. Pages 21 and 22: added red lines to sections to clarify boundary of the public R.O.W.
5. Page 23: Updated cross section to reflect 20 foot wide travel lanes, plus red lines to clarify the boundary between public R.O.W. and private outlots.
6. Page 26, "Open Space" descriptions:
  - a) Clarified the description of the retail plaza near the intersection at University Ave.
  - b) Outlot 1 has been combined with a portion of the previous 'linear park' to make one continuous outlot for the bike/pedestrian access around the southern and western edges of the site.
  - c) Outlot 4 has been created between Lots 3 and 4 as a privately owned 'green' open space.
7. Page 28: Added a sentence to item 9, at the end of the paragraph, regarding the facades of parking structures.
8. Revised the graphics on pages 30, 31, 32, and 33 to reflect changes in the conceptual plan:
  - a) Lot 11 has been reconfigured,
  - b) drive lanes entering the plaza from University Avenue have been lengthened,
  - c) right-in/right-out access has been added between Lot 10 and 11.
9. Added page 34, showing conceptual elevations of the project as it might appear from University Avenue and Whitney Way.
10. Added page 35, showing a site cross section illustrating the grade change across the site in relation to possible development.
11. Added page 37, a Preliminary Grading Plan.
12. Page 38, Development Standards; combined previous development standards into one table.
13. Revised the Conceptual Phasing drawings on pages 39, 40, 41 and 42.
  - a) All phases include a mix of structured and surface parking
  - b) Lots 5, 7, 8 and 9 are only developed with structured parking.
  - c) Building pads on Lots 3, 7, 8 and 9 not used for surface parking.
14. Page 43, Zoning Text; For Minimum and Maximum Building Heights, reference is made to the development standards shown on page 38.
15. The appendix entitled "Discussion of Larger Setbacks on Arterials" was removed.
16. Page 52: Added "Conceptual Transit Plan" per Metro Transit.
17. Page 53: Added "Conceptual Location of Fire Lanes".

---end---

UDL 10-6-10 No. 3 Hlow

## Urban Design Commission Comments & Developer's Response

### Issue 1: Trigger/Phasing/Parking Approach.

UDC Comments:

1. Need a trigger point to provide for structured parking beyond the surface parking shown on Page 36 (application packet).
2. Need a phasing plan that addresses the development of structured parking and infrastructure.
3. Think of the site in terms of phases. That will also give the neighbors some sense of how it's going to develop.
4. Provide information on proposed uses and trigger points.
5. Need to see what threshold of development will tip structured parking
6. Consider keeping one-third of surface parking green until building build-out occurs.
7. Lake Forest graphic doesn't mesh with the amount of surface parking; need some sense of what project will look like.
8. Encourage lower level parking below buildings to reduce surface parking.

Developer Response:

- + The revised phasing plans illustrate a mix of surface and structured parking in all phases. For example, Phase 1 shows development on Lot 1 with a building having parking on the lower level, and retains most of the existing PSC parking ramp.
- + Buildings on all lots (except Lot 11) are encouraged to include lower level parking and structured parking.
- + The development of Lots 5, 7, 8 and 9 per the Development Standards shown on page 38 of the GDP document are only possible with structured parking.
- + The Development Standards (page 38) also include uses, parking ratios, building heights, building area, and parking counts.

### Issue 2: Neighborhood Connections:

UDC Comments:

1. Provide a stronger connection with linear park and neighborhood.
2. Try to create some visual connection from the bike path and people driving on University Avenue.

Developer Response:

- + The revised concept plan creates opportunities for links to adjacent neighborhoods by surrounding the site with bike and pedestrian access (Outlot 1).
- + The only vehicles on Outlot 1 are fire and service vehicles.

### **Issue 3: Building Heights:**

---

UDC Comments:

1. Still concerned with the specificity of the building heights relative to the lots. Specifically Lots 3, 4 and 5; it would be reasonable and beneficial if there were a height limit specified for those lots. Something like 75-80-feet seems more reasonable.

2. The neighborhood is very concerned about building heights and parking. There needs to be a description or detailing with regard to the height of the buildings and the density and location of at least some of the parking, it's going to be very hard to sell the project.

Developer Response:

+ The building heights have been further defined per Development Standards on page 38 of the GDP document. These standards tie a range of specific heights to each lot, allowing for variation in the building heights.

+ The maximum height for six story buildings is 95' as measured by City of Madison standards. Refer to the elevation and sections on pages 34 and 35.

### **Issue 4: Wellhead Protection:**

---

UDC Comments:

1. I want to know more about the project wellhead protection provisions.

[+Munson replied that only when we get a clean phase 2 that the DNR and says you have met your environmental obligation can we move forward with the project. We take very seriously the remediation and possibilities of contamination. This is a statutory process that we will follow. We're also working with the City on the stormwater management plan. We will meet all the filtration and volume control issues in terms of stormwater runoff.]

Developer Response:

+ Language is incorporated into the GDP document (and draft staff report) addressing this issue. See page 47 of the GDP document.

+ We have also been working with the City of Madison water utility and the City's Engineering Dept to ensure that this project will not have an adverse affect on the City's water supply.

+ Per Madison Water Utility, the following uses are prohibited:

- a). photo processing
- b). printing and duplicating
- c). businesses that use hazardous chemicals as defined by the EPA.
- d). paint and coating manufacturing
- e). any proposed use from having a fuel storage tank, or storing any hazardous or toxic materials
- f). stormwater impoundments / retention areas in Zone A.

## Issue 5: Site/Architecture:

---

### UDC Comments:

1. Happy to see that architectural style is not mandated in the zoning text. I would like to see some architectural language for the parking structure.
2. No more than twelve consecutive parking stalls without tree islands; need more landscaping for surface parking lots.
3. Parking lot at the corner of University Avenue and Whitney Way needs attention, can live with adjacent surface parking along both streets but reduce parking in the area.
4. The corner is the “fulcrum” of the site, should be treated as entry at University Avenue. Eliminate drive at Whitney near corner and eliminate the “triangle” of asphalt.
5. No pedestrian connectivity through the center of the site.
6. The spatial arrangement between Lots 7, 12 and 11 needs work.
7. Page 31 is a zoning document up for approval with no restrictions of what happens with the edge condition.
8. No connections or grids clearly defined with the GDP that show how things clearly connect.
9. Connectivity through the site is a big deal. It has to have a sense of place.
10. What I feel is missing from your site plan is that your grid needs to be in there. There needs to be a legible way to connect between all of these various lots as a secondary means of communication for people. I’m uncomfortable with that lack of connection.

### Developer Response:

- + Language added for parking structure façade design, page 28 (last sentence).
- + More detail added relating to sidewalk connections and landscaping. The parking counts accommodate tree islands.
- + The corner of University and Whitney has been revised to make parking areas screened better by the proposed conceptual building designs. The drive at Whitney enhances the network to vehicular connections in and around the site.
- + Pedestrian connections increased; pedestrians are encouraged to walk in front of retail shops as they travel between buildings on the site.
- + The southern and western edges of the project have bike and pedestrian access, and the other edges along arterials are fronted with buildings and convenience parking.
- + The sense of place for the project is intended to be the internal street, and is the primary connection through the site.
- + SIP level site and building details will be addressed as part of SIP submissions.

## Other UDC Comments:

### UDC Comments:

1. Question staffs' read on the project (necessary for further consideration).
2. Your comparison to the Beltline should stop tonight because this isn't the Beltline; it's Hilldale, way more special than the Beltline.
3. You've got such a great opportunity and I think you've realized it here. There's an opportunity here for efficiency of asphalt so you get more green spaces.
4. Lots 7, 12 and 11 – spatially it looks like IHOP.
5. From a marketing standpoint, it would be extremely beneficial to incorporate some underground parking.
6. Sense of place throughout site is needed. Outlot 3 is exemplary. Ped connectivity through site is extremely important.
7. Coming together. But significant concerns about parking/parking garage and corner treatment.
8. Focus on University Avenue frontage and triangle intersection; need a big idea, it's missing. Need plan for parking structure triggers. Need more info on impact on wellhead and protecting aquifer. Not ready for GDP because pieces missing at University and Whitney Way corner area – some good ideas = linear park, internal street.
9. Building heights a concern. Need more specific language please. Architecture guidelines for Lot 12 parking structure are needed, must be better than typical parking structure.
10. Density is positive, increase visual and pedestrian connectivity. Lot 11 is key and must anchor the site and reinforce street edge on University, no parking on University on Lot 11. Provide a phasing plan including surface, underground and structured parking. Indicate green space and intent of green space to encourage pedestrian and visual connectivity.
11. Interior street is conceptually interesting. Outside street frontage is not. Corner at Whitney Way and University needs stronger anchor and less pavement.
12. Preserve mature trees where possible.

### Developer Response:

+ OK

+ See revised conceptual plan for Lots 7, 11 and 12.

+ All phases include a mix of surface and structured parking.

+ Intent is for the new street to become the key element for creating sense of place.

+ See revised concept for revised concept for the corner site at Univ. and Whitney.

+ See Development Standards, page 38 for added detail regarding building heights and parking requirements.

+ See revised conceptual plan for Lot 11.

+ See revised conceptual plan.

+ Mature trees will be saved wherever possible. Best opportunities are around the edges of the site.